



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O INTELLEVATE
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

COPY MAILED

MAR 23 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Aldrich, et al. :
Application No. 10/814,312 : DECISION
Filed: 30 March, 2004 :
Attorney Docket No. 1020.P18895 :

This is a decision on the petitions filed on 27 February, 2009, to revive an application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

The petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

As to Allegations of
Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee. (However, it does not appear that a terminal disclaimer and fee are due here.)

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 5 April, 2007, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 5 July, 2007.

(There is some lack of clarity as to under whose control the application was at the time of abandonment, however, the non-final Office action was mailed to a Customer Number (59796) associated with the address consistent in part with that above (i.e., C/O Intellevate, P.O. Box 52050, Minneapolis MN 55402)—although the Customer Number was not that present number

(57035), and the attorney/agent associated with that Customer Number appears not to have been firm that filed the application (i.e., Blakely Sokoloff Taylor Zafman LLP, which was associated with Customer Number 08791).)

The application went abandoned after midnight 5 July, 2007.

The Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 14 November, 2007.

On 27 February, 2009, Petitioner John F. Kacvinsky (Reg. No. 40,040) filed, *inter alia*, a petition (with fee) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) averring unintentional delay, a reply in the form of an amendment, and made the statement of unintentional delay.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue.

*Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay.¹ In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, Petitioner **must** make such an inquiry.*

*If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) was unintentional, Petitioner **must** notify the Office.*

The record (including the petition filed on 27 February, 2009) does not necessitate a finding that the delay between midnight 5 July, 2007 (date of abandonment), and 27 February, 2008 (date of filing of grantable petition), was not unintentional.

Rather, the Patent and Trademark Office is relying in this matter on the duty of candor and good faith of Petitioner's Counsel John F. Kacvinsky (Reg. No. 40,040) when accepting Petitioner's representation that the delay in filing the response was unintentional.²

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts

¹ See 37 C.F.R. §10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997).

² See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109) (applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.³

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).⁴

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority.

Unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁵))

As to Allegations of Unintentional Delay

It appears that the requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) have been satisfied.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The instant application is released to the Technology Center/AU 2183 for further processing in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the instant decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the TC/AU in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to that change in status need be directed to the TC/AU where that change of status must be effected—that does not occur in the Office of Petitions.

³ See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

⁴ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

⁵ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2⁶) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./
John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.